



WCETR 2011

## Self-evaluation by candidate music teachers during individual instrument lesson education (Marmara University case study)

Sibel Coban<sup>a\*</sup><sup>a</sup> Marmara University, Ataturk Education Faculty, Department of Fine Arts, Istanbul, Turkey

---

### Abstract

This study examined the ideas of music teacher candidates about themselves through self-assessment during individual instrument lessons. The findings indicated that candidate music teachers whose personal instrument was the guitar could play their instruments sufficiently well to succeed in the course. The group who specialized in playing wind instruments expressed the lowest level of agreement with the statement, “I play my instrument well enough to be successful in the course”

© 2011 Published by Elsevier Ltd. Open access under [CC BY-NC-ND license](#).

*Keywords: Occupation Education, Instrument Education, Self-Evaluation*

---

### 1. Introduction

There are two variables in the process of learning and teaching, “*The learner and the teacher*”. In this sense, the research may be considered within the concept of metacognition, which consists of processes such as the learning process of the candidate teachers (learners) who are taking instrument training, observing themselves, controlling and evaluating their performance, and which helps them learn how to learn.

The concept of metacognition was first used by Flavell, who defined metacognition as “the awareness of the individual’s self cognitive processes and the usage of this awareness in order to control self-cognitive processes”; (Flavell; 1985, p. 104) . In other words, it is the awareness of the individual’s own awareness, his view on what he thinks and the eye on his own cognitive process (Tosun,& Irak, 2008).

Metacognition consists of the skills that enable learning to take place automatically. Metacognition is indeed a way of learning to learn. The skills expected to develop in an individual with metacognition are as follows (Cited from: Çakıroğlu, 2007; Doğanay, 1997):

- The individual’s self awareness and his ways of learning
- Behaving consciously
- Self-control
- Planning
- Observing how he learns
- Self-Arrangement

---

\* Sibel Coban. Tel:+90 216 345 47 05  
E mail address: [cobansibel@gmail.com](mailto:cobansibel@gmail.com)

## • Self- Evaluation

### 1.1. Self- Evaluation

According to Schraw and Dennison (1994) metacognition gathers around two types of skills; the first is self-evaluation and the second is self-management. Self-evaluation is about the student's evaluation of his knowledge and skills. Self-management consists of self-awareness and also the awareness and observation of the process. Studies have shown that students who are successful at metacognitive self-evaluation and who have developed awareness regarding this skill are more strategic and perform better than students who are not aware of their skills. (Cited from: Çakıroğlu, 2007, p.26).

According to Lucangeli, Cornoldi, & Tellarini (1998), students with evaluation skills appraise the products and regulatory processes of their learning. Students can re-evaluate their goals and conclusions. Evaluation enables students to assess their performance of a task, students can compare their performances with each other and they can use the result of comparison to locate any errors in the solution process. (Cited from: Özsoy, Meniş, & Temur, 2009, p.156).

The theoretical basis of this study has been fictionalized on self-evaluation, which is expected to develop with the learners' metacognition and which is the last step of the skill-development process.

A review of the literature identified many studies related to the research topic, such as the evaluation of student tasks, evaluation models, evaluation types and teacher evaluations (Hewitt, 2005; Bergee, 2003; Hewitt, 2002; Hewitt, 2001; Kinney, 2009; Napoles, 2009). However, there are few studies of students' self-evaluation during the learning process.

A study by Morrison et al. (2004) found that secondary and high school students thought they performed better at a group of study tasks after a 5-week-study.

Hewitt (2002) reported that a secondary school group has increased self- evaluation scores after a 6-week process. Although these results show that students believe their own performance improved over time, self-evaluation may be inconsistent and inaccurate. Davis (1981) and Sparks (1990) found that elementary education students showed improved self-evaluation accuracy over time.

This study aimed to reveal how candidate music teachers evaluate their own performance in playing their chosen instruments during the professional education process. Participants were asked to grade their level of agreement with statements describing their views on self-evaluation regarding the course.

## 2. Methodology

The research used the descriptive method.

### 2.1. Population and Sample

Population is the Department of Fine Arts Education, Music Teachers Section Faculties of Education of the universities in Turkey. The study sample was limited to Marmara University Ataturk Faculty of Education, Music Teacher Section. The study included 170 students, 111 of whom are girls and 59 of whom are boys. The distribution of the students according to their specialist instrument is shown in Table 1.

*Table. 1 Instrument Specializations of the Study Group*

Instruments	f	%
String	61	35.9
Guitar	30	17.6
Wind	25	14.7
Voice	37	21.8
Other	16	9.4
Total	169	99.4
Without answer	1	.6
Totally	170	100.0

## 2.2. Data Collection Tools

The data collection tools used in the study comprised a personal data form and a questionnaire, which were prepared by the researcher. Demographic information was obtained from the personal data form. The study topic was examined via a questionnaire using a 5-point Likert type format. All participants (n=170) attended the Department of Music Education, Faculty of Education at Marmara University Atatürk. Participants were in years 1 to 4 and all receive individual instrument training.

## 2.3. Data Analysis

Data was evaluated using percentage, frequency, arithmetic average, standard deviation, t test, analysis of variance and chi square test.

## 3. Results

The state of agreeing with the given expressions regarding the evaluation phase of the course in the questionnaire conducted on the music teacher candidates who take individual instrument education is as follows:

The following response options indicate participants' self-evaluations regarding the course:

- I play my instrument well enough to pass the class.
- I feel that my playing has improved thanks to the individual instrument training.
- I believe I am successful at playing my instrument.
- I haven't reached my target proficiency level after entering the school.

Table. 2-a Arithmetic Averages and Standard Deviations of the statement "I play my instrument well enough to pass the class" according to the individual instrument variable regarding the differentiation state

	n	$\bar{X}$	sd
String	61	1.7833	1.2363
Guitar	30	2.5333	1.4077
Wind	25	1.7600	1.0116
Voice	37	2.0811	1.1396
Other	17	2.0000	1.2395

Table. 2-b One-Way ANOVA: Responses to the statement "I play my instrument well enough to pass the class" according to individual instrument variant.

	Sum of squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Between Groups	13.033	3	4.344	2.936	.035
Within Groups	218.967	148	1.480		
Total	232.000	151			

The level of agreement with the statement "I play my instrument well enough to pass the class." differed significantly ( $p=0.05$ ) according to the individual instrument variant.

Table. 2-c LSD results regarding the differentiation state of the statement "I play my instrument well enough to pass the class" according to individual instrument variant

	String	Guitar	Wind	Voice
String	x= 1.7833	.01	.05	
Guitar	.01	x= 2.5333	.05	
Wind	.05	.05	x= 1.7600	
Voice				x= 2.0811

Based on arithmetic average, the guitar group agreed most strongly with the statement, “I play my instrument well enough to pass the class”. The group that specialized in wind instruments expressed the least agreement. According to the LSD results of paired comparisons, there is a meaningful difference of .01 level between the string and guitar players; and .05 between the guitar and wind instrument players.

Table. 3 Arithmetic Averages and Standard Deviations of the Statements of the Music Teacher Candidates in Individual Instrument training course regarding self-evaluations

	n	x	sd
I feel that my playing has improved thanks to the individual instrument training.	168	3.8214	1.3283
I believe I am successful at playing my instrument.	169	3.5148	1.1908
I haven't reached my target proficiency level after entering the school.	168	3.2202	1.4536

When the arithmetic averages of the statements in Table 3 are taken into consideration on raw scores, the level of agreement among candidate music teachers is above 2.50, which is the average score. No significant difference was found in the level of agreement according to the individual instrument variant.

#### 4. Conclusion

According to the results in Table 2, the candidate music teachers receiving instrument training have made self evaluations regarding the instruments that they will use throughout their professional lives in terms of whether they have studied hard enough to attain the required level of proficiency at their instrument during their education process. According to Table 2 c, the results regarding the instrument types are as follows:

The guitar students evaluated their performance as being sufficient to pass the class. There is a significant difference of .01 levels between guitar students and string instrument. The Tables and the previous text refer to string instruments. The use of two descriptions for the same group may confuse readers. A difference of .05 levels between the wind instrument students and guitar and string instrument students. It is possible to interpret this result differently according to the categories of metacognitive knowledge and metacognitive control/ arrangement.

That is; it is accepted that bow instruments are more difficult to play in comparison to other instruments, as they are fretless and involve complex bowing techniques. For this reason, the training of bow instruments is started at younger ages. Due to the instrument's technical difficulties, students who cannot start instrument training at a young enough age have to study harder and more often to perform better and be successful.

The result may also be interpreted as follows, according to another professional reality:

Students who learn bow and wind instruments have the chance not only to become music teachers but also to perform in orchestras and chamber orchestras. As a matter of fact, in some research, results that support this comment have been revealed. Several previous studies have shown that such career options are a factor in students' professional choices.

Akinci, S. and E. Moray (2005) found that the primary professional aspiration among students of Marmara University is overseas education and then to be an orchestral musician.

A study by Çalışkan (2008) found that the professional perception among students who specialized in the guitar was significantly lower than students of violoncello, flute and vocal training.

Although no significant variation was found in students' responses to the statements in Table 3, it is still possible to interpret the values: In accordance with the students' self evaluations, it was found that 76% of the students thought that they had improved due to instrument training, 70% thought that they had been successful at their instruments and 64% thought that they had not attained their targeted goals.

As a result, it is still possible to say that a certain level of comprehension has developed, in terms of self-evaluation according to the metacognition concept, among candidate music teachers being educated at Marmara University.

## References

- Akıncı, S., & Alkan, M. E. (2005, 14-16 Nisan). Üniversitelerde Lisans Eğitimi Düzeyinde Müzik Öğrenimi Gören Öğrencilerin, Çalgılarını Çalışma Tutum ve Alışkanlıklarının, Bazı Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi. *Müzik Sempozyumu Bildiri Kitabı*, Erciyes Üniversitesi Güzel Sanatlar Fakültesi, Kayseri.
- Bergee, M. J. (2003). Faculty Interjudge Reliability of Music Performance Evaluation. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 51(2), 137.
- Çakıroğlu, A. (2007). Üstbiliş. *Türkiye Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi (TSA)*, 11(2), 21-27.
- Çalışkan, T. (2008). *Müzik Öğretmeni Adaylarının Bireysel Çalgı Eğitiminde Güdülenme Düzeyleri ve Başarı Durumları Arasındaki İlişki*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Marmara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü. İstanbul.
- Davis, L. P. (1981). *The Effects of Structured Singing Activities and Evaluation Practice on Elementary Band Students' Instrumental Achievement*. Unpublished Dissertation, The Ohio State University, Ohio, USA.
- Doğanay, A. (1997). Ders dinleme sırasında bilişsel farkındalık ile ilgili bilgilerin kullanımı. *Çukurova Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 1(11), 25-38.
- Flavell, J. H. (1985). *Cognitive Development* (3rd Ed.). New Jersey: Prentice - Hall.
- Hewitt, M. P. (2001). The Effects of Modeling, Self-Evaluation, and Self-Listening on Junior High Instrumentalists' Music Performance and Practice Attitude. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 49(4), 307.
- Hewitt, M. P. (2002). Self-Evaluation Tendencies of Junior High Instrumentalists. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 50(3), 215.
- Hewitt, M. P. (2005). Self-Evaluation Accuracy among High School and Middle School Instrumentalists. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 53(2), 148-161.
- Kinney, D. W. (2009). Internal Consistency of Performance Evaluations as a Function of Music Expertise and Excerpt Familiarity. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 56(4), 322-337.
- Lucangeli, D., Cornoldi, C., & Tellarini, M. (1998). Metacognition and learning disabilities in mathematics. In T.E. Scruggs & M.A. Mastropieri (Eds.), *Advances in Learning and behavioral disabilities*, (pp.219-285). Greenwich: JAI Press Inc.
- Morrison, S. J., Montemayer, M., & Wiltshire, E. S. (2004). The Effect of a Recorded Model on Band students' Performance Self-Evaluations, Achievement and Attitude. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 52, 116-129.
- Napoles, J. (2008). Relationships Among Instructor, Peer, and Self-Evaluations of Undergraduate Music Education Majors' Micro-Teaching Experiences. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 56(1), 82-91.
- Özsoy, G., Memiş, A., & Temur, T. (2009). Metacognition, Study Habits and Attitudes. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, 2 (1), 154-166.
- Schraw, G., Dennison, R. (1994). Assessing metacognitive awareness. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 19, 460-470.
- Sparks, G. E. (1990). *The Effect of Self-Evaluation on Musical Achievement, Attentiveness, and Attitudes of Elementary School Instrumental Students*. Unpublished Dissertation, Louisiana State University, Eunice, USA.
- Tosun, A., & Irak, M. (2008). Üstbiliş Ölçeği-30'un Türkçe Uyarlaması, Geçerliği, Güvenirliği, Kaygı ve Obsesif-Kompulsif Belirtilerle İlişkisi, *Türk Psikiyatri Dergisi*, 19(1), 67-80.